Berkeley Friday, August 6, 1965

Must Remain in
Transcription Room

(Amid all the chaos of what seems to be a double recording for the first minute of this tape, Mr. Nyland can be heard saying:)

So, now again, who would like to, who would like to say something? In the couple of meetings we have had to date, we have touched on a variety of different subjects or viewpoints, tonight there are a few others who have not been there, maybe there is something. In all of you there ought to be by this time some idea of what, what Work means and if you want to find out more about it, you've had some experiences ..... bring it up.

Q: I started by asking this afternoon a question that you told me to bring up this evening, uh ... I asked you, when you are observing yourself, you are divided into an observer and an observed. Uh, my question was, is it possible for the observer to stop observing the observer but to become aware of itself so that the observer and that which observes and that which is observed are the same thing?

Mr. Nyland: Who of the older people has any kind idea about that now? Several of you must have had similar kind of experiences or at least had an impression of perhaps something of that kind happen, and then if you experienced it, how did you explain it, or don't you know what he is talking about? Who knows, who knows something of that kind? It doesn't matter if you can explain it and it doesn't matter if you understand it quite or clearly, even if you would give an indication of something that is a response in you that you know this kind of a thing does happen, and it is then, it is as if something else is observing the observer. You see, one knows it by experience, and it is a strange thing, because in the first place, we talk about separating something which then could become objective, then something else again starts to

separate from these two and looks at these two, and it looks then as if that becomes observer and the observer in the first place is stepping. Right? (A: I'm not sure.) No? Who is sure, that is another question. We're only talking about a direction of something.

Q: Well, I was thinking more in terms of something that x doesn't feel like it is something else is separated out to become a new observer so that you get three things, but almost that's the - it's a tremendous feeling that it's one thing and there's nothing outside of it.

Mr. Nyland: Who becomes aware of the other one stepping?

Q: I don't understand your question.

Mr. Nyland: You see, if something steps, does that what steps know it by itself, and what is it in that particular one that knows it is stepping. It is always a separation, you know, whenever one makes a statement about oneself, wherever you start, something is then different from what goes on. There's always a separation, in that way it is fairly easy to say 'I'. I have something which is observing me. That means then there is something that is splitting off. Because if I remain totally subjective, nothing of me becomes objective in any sense and, of course, it is that kind of an experience which we know mentally, well enough, that certain things can continue in the brain of different sections of the brain, doing different things of a mental capacity or mental function. It is possible that the brain functions with different sections functioning at the same time. One knows this; one can have different thoughts at the same time, at the same time regulate different activities from the brain. So, it is nothing unusual that one is divided, and in many cases one knows that one is constantly divided xx - as a matter of fact, very seldom that one is One. So the question of separation is not so difficult. But when something starts

to function in a certain way, in an objective sense and is an observer, and sees something and then steps, who knows that it is stepping? You know what I mean?

Q: Yes, who knows, who knows that it has stopped observing.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, exactly. It's a process that has been set in motion and apparently it is set in motion by something that endows the observer with the possibility of observing. And again, even before there is something that has the possibility of stopping the observer, you could ask, which tells the observer to start observing? I touched on it this afternoon because I said something about Magnetic Center, about a real wish which is different from that what takes place in the mind. And of course one can continue, you might say, to philosophize about it. It's very much like a picture which has a picture of a picture on it, and then in that is another picture of ... you know, you've seen these things. Someone sitting reading a book and in the book someone's sitting reading a book. But who has this, who has experienced this, because it is important to see it. I start out by trying to connect certain things in myself, which I say they ought to function differently from the way I am usually functioning, which in itself presupposes that I question the state in which I am, that if I call that what I am usually unconscious state, something in the unconscious state becomes aware of that, that it is unconscious, because if it weren't, I would simply continue without knowing that there is a difference between consciousness and unconsciousness. When I consider the fact that perhaps an unconscious state need not be, I must already have some kind of inclination, or some kind of a hunch that a conscious state also can exist, and then it is very much like having a state of sleep in which I dream about something else, so that the state of sleep you might say is disturbed. It is true in ordinary life, when I sleep

physically that when I have a dream, I dream about something that then at that time, in my dream, becomes a reality thinking that it is actually so, only when I wake up I realize it was a dream and was not reality. But during that time that I have the dream, it is quite real to me, even to the point of having a nightmare. So If I compare now myself being in a sleeping waking state, which is just another way of saying that I have an unconscious state and I believe that it is possible for me to become conscious, the very fact that I call my state as it is usually unconscious presuppposes that I know something about consciousness. I cannot say that a thing is dark when I compare it to the possibility of light, unless I have had an idea that it need not be dark a ll the time. So I start out by trying to imagine and very often I have to use that kind of a method to imagine as if something is already more awake or more conscious regarding myself. And I assume then tha t that what I now assume to be and I know is not real, that by giving it sufficient practice, that it might become real. When one has a body of this kind, one doesn't know what it is; it may be a comet, it may be a planet, it may be something that acts in accordance with certain laws, and I don't know what law it is, the assumption is tha t it is something which it may not be, it may be an (elipsical) orbit, and it may be a hyperbole, and it may be parabole. That I do not know, but I start assuming that it is an elipse, and with that I start to calculate what an elipse or a certain object describing an elipse would have to do. I make up a tremendous amount of mathematical calculations; I base it on that as a working hypotheses, until I find out that the different observations do not, or do, correspond to that what mathematically ought to be correct. And from that kind of work, I determine that as long as all my observations are satisfied, I can then conclude that it is either an elipse or whatever it may be.

All kinds of scientific process, progress is based on that possibility.

First, the assumption that something works in accordance with a law which is determined by the different factors I have accumulated, and I call it in science, a working hypothesis, like one assumed that matter was made up of molecules, and perhaps as atoms, and that was as far as Dalton, or anyone of the old days, assumed to be until we got to the ideas of electrons and neutrons and so forth. Then the working hypotheses proved not to answer everything that we had as facts, and we couldn't place it, and we couldn't place many phenomena that actually started to exist, and apparently did exist in accordance with certain laws, we didn't know the law, and gradually we had to change that into another working hypothesis, by introducing the theory of relativity or the expansion of space, or the returning Universe, or whatever way you want to call that. We changed simply our ideas but still it is an hypothesis and it is not as yet the truth.

The truth we would call an axiom. An axiom means that there is something that is there without having any question. Regarding Work, we assume many times for the sake of having something guiding us, that that what we are seeing is the truth. And on that kind of an assumption, we continue to observe as many phenomena of ourselves as we can, and gradually out of the collection of such data, we will distill an axiom regarding ourselves, by the elimination of all the factors that otherwise would affect us in our judgment. And finally because of that we will reach a state in which we say 'this is truth for me' and if I continue to investigate what is truth for others I will gradually, after a sufficient number of observations come to an absolute truth, beyond which there is nothing else; that is, everything then has become truthful and I as an observer have the knowledge and at that point

become one with such a truth, and then my Being rests on the Truth.

This is the kind of process that we are trying to find out how to reach the truth about ourselves; what is actually so, and what is without any further questioning. Again, philosophically, this whole idea of what is for me finite, and how can I reach infinity; it is a problem that one is concerned with, particularly in a religious sense, even if you don't want to express it in any particular way that has a religious terminology, or if perhaps you feel that in such terminology which might sound a little theoretical that you do not give enough value to that what may be religious, either as feeling or as a thought.

Still this question of ourselves being what we are as we are on earth. It now becomesx2uquite obvious that it is really possible xx for a man to see beyond himself, to see outside of himself, which at the present time he has to imagine and is there a possibility for man to actually to experience that what is at the present time not possible for him to experience? This of course leads to a theory of a possible evolution of man, and the assumption then must be that that what he is at the present time is not complete enough. As such, it is quite a good motivation for wanting to Work because in the first place, I start, if I believe that certain changes can take place and everything of my life as experience of course indicates that it can change, that I, by means of living, by means of gaining experience, and by means of growing up in the regular sense of the word, that I will accumulate more and more data which will give me, I hope, more wisdom of life.

Sometimes I call it understanding, but it is not really understanding because I'm not sufficiently supporting it, and that it is part of me. I still stay in my ordinary understanding on the periphery and I do not know how to penetrate deeper into that what is essential values.

It's very difficult to become more and more essential, because in the first place I get tired, and in the second place, it is unknown territory, I don't want to enter it and I'd much rather leave things alone and as I grew older, it is not that I continue to want to live but that I really am satisfied with what I already have, and after some time I will give up. So this whole question of finding out what is me as a finite creature, that is, as a limited creature, as a creature which at the present time exists, and for which I hope that it can develop into something else, something more useful maybe, or something that has more knowledge and the knowledge being translated into more comprehension of what is involved and more and more finding a place for myself, that when I try now to consider that what I at the present time have accumulated as facts for a working hypothesis, thatI hope that that will ultimately change into a definite axiom for myself. The reason for that is that I am looking in my life for solidity. I want to have something to stand on and it cannot be my understanding because that is only something that is below me and I stand under that. I wish to stand on top.

Try to understand this. That what I am at the present time is based on all experiences that I have had. That what I hope for is ahead of me in the future. When I consider myself wanting to evolve, I have to have a foothold or something on which I can stand. In general I say I can stand on my past. That means I can stand on that what I have experienced and I hope that by means of memory I actually will arrive at the truth of my experiences, as I have experienced them, without having to question them. This I think presupposes that a man, when he experiences something, that he then already sees the truth. This you might say is an assumption, and if I feel that it is an assumption, I have to

preve it. It means this, that if I new continue te experience, I have the task ef finding eut if my experiences actually are giving me the truth at the present time. Se this is the practical applicatien ef wanting te try by means ef seeing myself in a certain way, that I reach a cenclusien which is net enly permanent, but I can confrent at any time at any kind ef attitude, and it still will remain the same. This would be fer me a degree ef absoluteness and when I have experienced such, yeu might say, such a concept within myself, that there is ne further questien then I knew that the observatien ef myself is really truthful and free from all kind ef interpretatiens.

Se when I new try te test what is it in me at the present time, trying te leek at myself and trying te interpret, er at least trying te understand it, am I truthful abeut that? Can I actually see what is taking place without having any theughts er likings. That is, is it possible fe r me te have a recerding apparatus which enly recerds. I say this is like a test that ene makes in erder te find eut what is the instrument with which we werk. The [illegible] instrument ef ene's mind and the instrument ef ene's feeling center, and in hew far dees it recerd facts which are without questien. I say it is a questien new ef finding eut in yeur ewn life what is the truth fer yeu, and hew eften and perhaps all the time that I see semething and, ef myself, and immediately explain it, interpret it, justify it, er rationalize it. Yeu can see that there may be certain facts that I am willing te accept. If that is the truth, really, I alse start te questien such a statement, because where are such facts which I am willing te accept as they are, that they are incentreversial, that they remain whatever they are from whatever standpeint I leek at them. I say there are very few ef that kind.

One fact is that I AM BORN, THAT I am on earth, even that sometimes is questioned, but let's say for the sake of argument that we could accept that, and that I knew a little bit about it by the fact that I happened to appear on earth and that I happen to breathe. But what next? Can I say that matter for me is a fact in an absolute sense, or do I have to admit that matter as I knew it exists in different configurations, aggregates, in different waves of density, different kind of volume, and as soon as I allow that and I knew differences in states of matter, as a solid or a liquid or a gas, that then where is the end, because do I consider then magnetism, matter? Electricity, and electronics and different electrons which I have never seen, but knew simply as a result of whatever they happen to do that certain things have taken place, do I ascribe that to a form of matter which is so extremely light that I have no means even of detecting it? So, that already is not a very good thing to say this I knew for sure, because it seems to be ephemeral.

Psychologically speaking I have absolutely no measurements. All I knew that I ~~kxiii~~ have a certain amount of what I call a brain function. I have a feeling, I have sometimes a knowledge which reaches me through feeling, I call it a hunch, something that I knew is true but I don't know where it came from and I cannot define it further and it is of very little use because I cannot even explain how I get it. I knew for a fact that there are states in me which I would consider conscious. This I think I cannot deny because it belongs to an experience in which there was a different kind of state, with which apparently I took in that what is called an impression, and in which in that state of an experience it seems as if the usual functions of myself had stopped to function in that way.

In other words, I have experience which I knew are different, which are accidental, because nothing that I could do about it could bring them about and no wish on my part can make them appear, and nevertheless they haveleft such an indellible impression on me that I classify them as an experience which I will not forget. By that I mean of course that it has been so inscribed in me that it has touched something unusual which when I will not forget it becomes permanent.

There is another fact which ~~I~~ of course I knew since I judge by what is happening around me - that is the fact of dying, that fact of physical death. I can't get ~~x~~ away from that. Sooner or later it will have to ~~xxxxxx~~ happen. I see it, liking it or not, it is something that must be accepted. There are a few other facts which are facts to me which I cannot deny. For instance, there is the possibility of burning, there is the possibility of being destroyed by some means, either flames or chemicals or poison. There is definitely the possibility of danger which threatens what I call my life, and outside of that I can more or less philosophize about the possibility of the existence of relationships where I know that certain influences can go from me to someone else, or that I can become influenced by someone else but usually I don't know enough about it to define it properly, and when it comes to the recreation of such an influence on someone else, I am really very much lost because I don't know how to do it, how to select the proper words and how to be regarding someone I know that the desired result actually will be reached.

So here we are with these kind of things that one could say on the basis of that I could form a solidity for myself, unchangeable and without any question then becoming absolute because it would always exist and even exist longer than I would exist. I can also become

x very much aware of something I call time and the only explanation I can find is that time is a part of me, simply because I experience it. That is as far as I can go because the time for me is not the same as the time for someone else, and the time of every unit, either on earth or outside the earth is probably different as it is being experienced. And the strange thing of that what I call my time is that it starts to become - to be in existence when I am born, or perhaps at the moment when I am conceived and that it stops when I die, because nothing is then left of that kind of subjectivity to have time as such become expressed in my life, and time stays with me during my life, I cannot help it, I cannot do anything about it, I can only state the fact that it is there since I remain subject to it, and sometimes I say that it eats me, and that in time it will have eaten me completely so that I will die.

Whatever that particular function is of the concept of time, it can be extremely helpful, particularly since that any one time, timex is always with me. So, it is dependable, that is, I know that if it could be used it would be extremely helpful to me to use. Outside of myself on earth, I can make a few statements about other people more or less kx being the same as I am, and also I can have an idea that if I withdraw from earth, or would like to be away from earth and look at the totality of mankind, that then gradually the differences between human being would disappear, and I would come to a point from which I would judge the totality of everyone living as units existing on earth, all of them having the possibility of that kind of life, expressed in their individual manifestations, but from that kind of standpoint away from earth, I would became moreobjective since I will not see the differences and I will see more the essential qualities.

Now, what does it help me to see these things? It only means that what I wish, if I look for solidity, that I have to base it on something that I know, that I have experienced, and something that is for me then what I call reality and it isn't the past of myself, and that at each moment that I live I add to my past and that the totality of that kind of foundation is constantly subject to every kind of experience which I will experience as time continues and flows through me. What does it help me? I assume that that what I now call my past and what is solidity, that that is the real truth. I test it out with myself at the present time and I find that that what I now experience is not always the truth, or perhaps questionable.

The logical conclusion is that what is the past is also and has been subject to exactly the same thing. Now I say that in that past there a re certain things that were absolute. One of them is that fact that I can experience and have experienced at times moments I do not forget, and I classify them as conscious moments. Dependent entirely on that kind of taste that one has at such a time, and the realization that when I experience that, that you might say that life, as I knew it, stops for me for that moment, it might create in one a desireability to see if such a state of consciousness - and I compare it like that because it is an event for me in which apparently the unconsciousness of my own subjectivity seems to stop - if that is a desirable state to experience, then I start out trying to find how can I make it artificially. This becomes the problem of one's life if one is really interested in finding a solution so that if in that state of consciousness I could still be alive, that then from that standpoint of that state I could start accumulating data which are more truthful, or even would reach an absoluteness of truth, and that then mk with this I could have a foundation which will not be disturbed regardless of

whatever subjective conditions would be in the surrounding or affect it.

This now becomes the problem of how to reach that - how to develop a way of becoming conscious, and what in this particular process I can expect and how I try to solve such difficulties when they appear. If I become observant and then try to make within me something a part of me function in an objective way - I can call that observer. I can call then the instrument with which it observes a telescope, an instrument with which certain things can be seen and that what I am becomes objective. The reason why I think about this possibility is because there is within one always a desire to free oneself from the bondage of earth; this is not contrary to the use of that what is ~~xxxx~~ one's life during one's lifetime, in order when I live and I am threatened, that I will protect this life. But it is still questionable if that what I am when I was born or conceived, if that was a natural way for life to become manifest on earth, and the only conclusion that I can draw is that it happens on earth and becomesnatural for earth. If that is true, I question the fact is it natural outside of earth? And is it something that becomesuniversal as a manifestation restricting a form of life, and why should life then be put in this kind of a manifestation, you might say temporarily, while a human being x is alive, if that form of life continues to exist after he dies.

Much of this is now based on assumption, and that of course is a working hypothesis that certain forms of life are manifested and they remain within, and that when that what is now his body disappears, that something else continues to exist. I say it is a working hypothesis because it is based on the assumption that eternity exists. The assumption of eternity is dependent again on the assumption of infinity. Infinity exists because that what I call finite by defini-

tion, I must say that if it is finite that I also must have the realization that something else is not finite. When I know that something I call finite, I define it as something that I know must exist which is not finite, and that the search for me, if I consider my subjectivity, that what xxx is now manifested on earth, that if I want to have a fuller understanding that I have to introduce an objectivity.

Again I'm quibbling a little about words, because if I still believe that the subjectivity can continue by being further developed, I don't need anything objective. So again I'm forced to test it. The assumption with Gurdjieff is that what a man is as represented by what we know of him and of which every person is an example, is that he is made up out of what I call three centers - a physical, a feeling center, and an intellectual one. And that if such a man tries to develop any one of these centers, that he could reach with any one of them a certain state, perhaps a certain state of objectivity, but unquestionably a state in which he could be mystically united with that what is, again, for a lack of a better word, above him. By above, we mean away from earth. That is, the fact that I can consider earth as a unit, if I can imagine that it shrinks to a point, that then that point anywhere where I disappear in space away from that point, I call above. In the sense of a solar system, that what is above for me is the range which ultimately in our solar system should reach the sun, and that when I want to explain it to myself, I say it will go through certain stepping stones, of which the first step happens to be the planetarylevel. And when I say that what is for me the direction of infinity, is by gradually going up the scale, again I say 'up' which means that in that is the possible evolution of man, he should develop in the direction of fulfilling that what he should become and whatultimately with the earth he would become if only he had time enough.

The scale on which the earth - being what it is and the place it has cosmelogically speaking, not only in our solar system but the totality of our solar system as a point even - that that particular place of earth happens to be an unfortunate one. This you might say is again the assumption of the explanation of Gurdjieff in order to illustrate why man has the difficulties he has. And again, it would imply that if a man - if there were men on planets; that is, there were not human being but beings, or perhaps forms of life on other planets - that they would not be like a man as we knew them on earth but that they would function in a certain way and completely different from us, not having the difficulty of even developing, and that it would be possible for them to develop with that planet, and that the life span on such planets is entirely different from earth.

Historically we can prove perhaps a little bit of that because we have made records that in the elden days the life span was much andmuch longer, and that at that time that earth was as yet not in such an unfortunate, that it still was in a xxxxxxxx cosmic scale. Now, when I use the words cosmic scale, I'm talking about octaves. And to illustrate it I would like to do it but it would take much too far; I don't want to become too theoretical about xxxxxxx these things because all of this is related. And I remember how last year when I was here, I tried to condense in two hours all of <u>All and Everything</u> if you remember the book of Gurdjieff - and I consider it an utter failure. I don't want to fall into that same kind of a trap. And when I say now the Law of Octaves or the Law of Seven as Gurdjieff calls it - 'Heptaparaparshinokh' - with the different steppinders, as is explained in some of the chapters - Purgatory for instance - in the chapter of the Bokharian Dervish. The illustration of what is the law of seven? - what is the law of three. The law of seven being a law of phenomena;

the Law of Three being a law of pneumena. That what I do not see, that what is essential; the Law of Seven being the law of the periphery, that what I can observe as such as a phenomena. The relation between the two is the change over from seven into three.

And why Three? Because this becomes the fundamental of the Universe as such. And it is according to the law of three that everything is related, not only on earth, of which I see very little because I am hampered, you might say, by the clouds of the Law of Seven, but if I study and become a little bit more awake to the fact that the Law of Three must be hidden somewhere and that it is as it were beyond that what I call my activity, that then with this as a clue, a certain key, I will see that the Law of Three, the Law of Trimenia, that what is the Xxx Trinity, that what is explained in the Bible in many ways - God, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, or that what is explained on earth as man, woman and child, or whatever the Law of Three represents as we know about it and what Gurdjieff sometimes calls positive, negative and xxx neutralizer. And to understand the function of these three different xxx forces in relation to each other - all of that, it would carry me much too far to go into detail and if you want to know, read the book, there is quite a bit in it - you will find something that might x even appeal to you.

What is it that I want. I want to understand what is the reason that I have to Work. If I understand that the planet earth is not a planet, but what Gurdjieff calls unfortunate, it means that the place where earth is in the cosmic scale is such that at that particular place there is a tremendous amount of turmoil. It happens because in certain sections of an octave there are certain parts which are different from the other parts, and they are keeping the

other parts which are a little bit evener, like 'do', 're', Mi' or like 'sol la si', are kept separate because of a state which is called 'fa' and a state which is called 'si do.' Again, I say you have to read up on this if you are interested in that kind of a theory. And if you are and you find out then you will see that on that kind of a basis, the planet earth happens to occupy a place just exactly at the 'fa' of the cosmic, what is called there, the cosmic ray. Because of this, it is in a state of flux, of turmoil, of chaos, of a condition in which, let's say a result of a collision, if you remember that book that has been published and it has been republished recently, Worlds in Collision. It's interesting to see what sometimes an astronomer or some kind of a philosopher discovers and that in how far it does check with certain theories or assumptions which Gurdjieff has made.

The earth is in itsparticular possibility of progress wishing to become a real planet like the others - Saturn, or Mars or Venus, and rotate around the sun, which it does not but at the present time in such a way that it is counter-balanced by the moon. If earth could develop in that direction where it should be, it should become a real planet. But we on the earth do not live long enough to witness it, because the time length and the duration in which that kind of process will take place is far longer in times of our years than we are allotted, and even with the possibility of Methusala living 900 years, even then it is still questionable if a man like Methusala living for 900 years could become conscious during that particular period. I say this because during that particular time the amount of friction that the man experienced if not half or much less than what we have at the present time.

So there are two reasons why one should Work. In the first place, if you want to do something in your life, within the time that you were born and when you will die, you have to do it now, and do it concentratedly, and the advantage of trying to do it now is because everything of earth has trouble in trying to Wake Up. If Waking Up means progress towards the sun for each human being, in the same way as it would mean for the earth to become a real planet around the sun.

Now all of this - what has it got to do with the work for oneself individually? What is it that I want. I say something to stand on x which I can rely on, that what I now haveas the past is unreliable, to some extent at least I am questioning that whatever my personal interpretations have been in the past. I knew they continue and I want to eliminate as many of them as I can. And this intreduces, of course, the idea I would like to become objective in order to gather facts about myself xkx which then, as experience, represent the task which for me becomes irreputable. It is I have to look for that kind of solidity. Whichever way you now want to explain it, in any kind of philosophy or religion, you will have to come to this kind of conclusion. I don't care what you wish to call it. And you can study any religion or any philosophy in any way you like. The conclusion ultimately has to be that something must exist for man which is not of this earth and has a quality belonging to that towards which he wants to strive. For that reason, Gurdjieff says that the man with number one or two or three - that is a man in whom one of the centers, one of the three centers, predominates. So that man number one is a physical man, as it were. Not that he doesn't have the other two centers, but they are not as predominent as the physical center. The accent of his life is physically. The example of that is a fakir. The second is a monk - that is, a man who actually as he lives develops

his feelingx center, and perhaps at times might make emotional states which for him, in that particular phase, would give him an insight and a possibility of a Unity with what he calls religiously, because this is a religious man, his God. The third man is Yoga - that is, a pureYoga in the intellectual field. I'm not talking about Yoga as applied to differentother parts of the Yoga doctrine. A Yoga primarily would start in intellectualism, the development of one's brain, and also in that particular direction a Yoga can reach a state of unity with the totality of all wisdom, reaching a certain state of omniscience, at the exclusion unfortunately however of the other two centers. So that any one of the three centers developed to its fullest extent reaches a level away from earth which I could consider as conscious, because it separates man at such a time xx from the law of psychological gravity, but if he wished to return to earth and behave like a man should on earth with all three centers, at least to a certain extent developed. He would have to start all over again on the second center and when that is finished, he would have to work on the third.

Such a life does not exist for a man; that is, he has no time. Something ought to exist that ought to be able to develop the three centers simultaneously and this, of course, becomes x a tremendous problem. At the same time, it is the only solution for man to remain on earth as man, because none of the fakirs or the monks or the priests or the yogis are real men in that sense that they live on earth. They withdraw to their ivory tower or their particular cloister or their particular way of wanting to live physically, and they eliminate then not only many possibilities of their lives and receiving during life certain impressions; they limit themselves to a certain x set, and because of that they never will be in adjustment to that what might

be required for us as ordinary people. And none of us can even have the possibility of developing as one of these one-centered men par excellance.

Who is there among us as ordinary person to become a yogi or to become, really, a saint, or to become a fakir. It is not for us, not in ordinary life. We are not willing to sacrifice. Sometimes we say, yes, I would like to go to Tibet or I go to India or Japan or wherever Buddhism may be, or wherever this and that is more alive than at the present time happens to be here on the coast here or in New York or in America or in certain sections, or in perhaps the primitive world, or perhaps among the savages and so forth. Whatever it may be that I find, I have no time, no desire, no money, no possibility really to do this. And to use this as something that ought to be applicable in a general way of course it is utter nonsense. A few of us can go and sometimes do go and then divide as much as they can, whatever they have, among that what is now them here, and then leave it, sell, burn their bridges, go over and live in the country where they believe that that kind of a possibility still exists by associating with those who are in the same kind of direction and, let's say, could become assimilated.

But we have racial qualities. We have racial differences. We have differences of bringing up, we have differences of personalities, we have differences of that what are obstacles in our way. And it is not easy to say it is a difference between race, between color, between that what might be called Oriental, Occidental. What might be called Northern or tropical or all these kind of things. Of course, everyone of us is subject to that particular place where we were born and how we were brought up. And to adapt oneself to a new surrounding and

te really understand it, let alone understanding a doctrine which is foreign te us in many ways. Yeu see, much of this requires an xxx adjustment which is extremely difficult te make and where the possibility of going astray on the road, even with the best of intentions, is almost infinite.

I use this word now, infinite, simply because it means that I have no way of knowing the number of possible detours and I'm afraid that my life will not be long enough te come back again and again te the main road. If thereis something that could become objective in me, it has te be new. It has te be available te me at any one time. It has te be something that if I knew how te do it, I would have the chance or the desireor the strength te actualize it. What is meant? That at any one time I should have the possibility of becoming conscious. This presupposes that a state of consciousness is possible for me. Because this has te become very important. I have te have belief in a possibility that it can be done. When I havehad accidental states of awakening, I knew that it has been possible for me te experience it. It was not my doing but, nevertheless, I came inte a state in which it became a fact for me. So that eliminates that I don't have te question the possibility for me. The next thing is how do I reach it. It has te be based on a universal law which, if I understand that law, is also applicable te me because I belong te the universe in a very small way on a very xxx small planet in a very remote corner of the universe, if there are corners in the universe, but in any event someplace in which that what is still law operates in accordance with the totality of all laws, subject te one fundamental law which, if I start te think, if I start te meditate, has te be a law of three. Because you see a unit is no law. A unit has no simension. A law of three has a relationship. Pragmatically

speaking, I do not know that a m unit is, but I do know what in my good moments I would call a law of three. I may even look at phenomena and say seven. How do I make three? Seven is threeplus three plus one. The three I can find. Thatis, attempts in any kind of progress in which I wish to work or develop certain skills are subject to little bits of interferences.

I strike a 'do' with my intention of wanting to reach a certain point above me. Again I say in this case a point in which I have a dexterity, that what I want to accomplish, that what I want to learn. I start. The initial energy carries me up to a certain point. There is always a point in which I start to question because maybe the energy runs out. Maybes certain centers, you might say, elsse in on me. But it may not be sufficient although it makes me start to think and I write, I question. This thinking is the second step. In the octave it is 're'. It is the point at which I have to reorientate my direction and say, yes, it is right. I don't want to have 'do' anymore, I know. I know I am a little bit less filled with the enthusiasm or even the curiosity, but at Least I still hope that there is a possibility forme to reach another state. That other state is 'mi'. But in the state of 'mi', I have two chances. One is that I realize that from 'mi' I have to bring myself constantly up to the point of staying there. Otherwise, it seems asif naturally I return. Let's say it this way. The state of 'mi' is the state of the boiling point because the surrounding has a temperature below boiling point. So I am at 'mi' in a certain state in which I have to maintain something of myself extra, contrary to the surrounding, which I call natural law, which will affect me and bring me back again to the state perhaps where I started from, or in any event I run the risk that after the energies which have been exhausted and

without having any means of creating new energies that then I will return again from 'mi' to 'do.' This is the one possibility that I continue to describe for myself 'do re mi' 'mi re do' as a little triangle in which these three are related and in which they represent for me a small form of the law of three in which all three parts or all three angles have a certain function.

The second possibility is that when I am at 'mi', that then my desire to reach further into the next triangle according to the octave of 'sol la si', I have to do something very special, otherwise I will not come ther - I will go back to 'do.' I don't want to go back to 'do'; there is more than that what I started out with; there is not only an intelligent search for something, but a wish to make for myself a sacrifice so that it will balance my efforts and because of that kind of payment I will be able to overbridge what in the octave again is the bridge 'fa' which, as you know, in an octave represents a note and a half. It means that it is not just business as usual, from going from one note to another; it means that thereis something in the way that has to be removed. If it is not removed, at most I would see the possibility that is ahead of me, hoping but I will not do anything.

What will I do? At the point 'mi', I have to consider what I really wish. That is, that what I want to accomplish if I go through the development of an octave for myself and that what I wish to overcome. I say it is based on experience in life. What happens sometimes - I want to read a book and study a language. I accumulate data in the form of words, it gets a little monotonous, I have to go through a syntax and I have to see a little bit how the words are related and make sentences and still, although I may go through that point, I will come to a place where I am sometimes quite ready

to give up it looks as if it is too much, it looks as if it becomes a little nonsensical, maybe I feel if I would continue in some easier way but here are big volumes that I have to go through and I become a little bit discouraged because for me I do not see where it will lead to, and to go through this avalanche and accumulation of such data, not only that it would take time but I don't know if I have really the desire to accomplish that, and then a rationalization process sets in which will excuse me if I possible can and I'll find some kind of a reason why I don't want to do it. Many times we give up at that point, and it is quite usual - we do give up many times. This is a fact, a fact of life.

Now, the possibility that does exist when I am at that boiling point is that the desire for me is strong enough for me to realize that if I only could accomplish going across the 'fa' bridge, that then I would reach a certain state in which I knew I would not have to return to the original triangle of 'do re mi'. Again I say it is not theoretical, it is a very practical question. In the case of learning a language, maybe such an opportunity starts to exist which for me then becomes a fundamental influence. For instance, I may go to a country where they speak it, I may go and listen to someone who speaks it fluently, it may be little children speak it and I don't, it may be the necessity that I have to get along in that country and I have to be forced to learn it. How is it with music. I play, I come to a point where I cannot really play Beethoven correctly; always a little mistake in it but I play it aftter a fashion and I want to, and still I know in my heart I am not satisfied. The Fifth Sonata, it's all right, it sounds fine, but - and then I go to a concert and I hear someone ( ), he plays it and it just opens for me such a tremendous world of I'm so close to it, immediately when that takes place in me, I am filled again with that

what I new wish, with that of course I start the next morning study9ng.

One calls this an outside shock. Sometimes it is called a condition in which I am in account of which that what is outside of me takes on a configuration corresponding to my state. It looks like an outside shock. In many times it is dependent on me in this state of wishing to go further and overcome obstacles. This particular state is fed by the realization of si do of the octave at the end. 'Si do' means the possibility of becoming free. It means that that what is an octave can come to an end. It means that the second 'do' can be struck in correspondence with the first 'do'. This means that between the 'do' the octave can become a unit. It means for me that if I overbridge 'si do', that then I will experience something as a new cycle in which that what is the old cycle has become the past and something to stand on. It has become the solidity of myself, based on the experience of what went on while I went through that first octave. Si do in an octave scale is half a note. The difficulty there as an obstacle is that it is so dense, so almost solid, almost not possible to penetrate, it is not porous, it is so holding on to me as I try that the realization of that will be the fundamental conclusion that if I come through that I will be free.

You see, how this of course starts, how the octave is made into this octave, again how the law of three relates to the law of seven, what is the reason for such an octave law of existing in accordance with the different laws of the universe, the laws of involution and evolution. All of that I pass by. Read about it again and again if you want to become more clear. The fact remains that the si do, the realization of what prevents me from becoming ultimately free is exactly that what will create a wish when I am at 'mi' to overb4idge 'fa' and then at 'sol' I will have a different kind of

triangle, a different kind of life, a different kind of having been finished with a certain phase and now again entering another phase of the sol la si, which for me of course becomes another possibility of further development. I want to stand on a past based on the facts which are truthful. I want to be able to say that that what I knew, I knew. That what I see, I see. That what I do, I do. That what I feel is correct in my feeling and that what I think is original with me. I want to become a creature that is not dependent on association, where interpretations of a personal kind, either mentally or emotionally need not enter when I do not wish. When the question of association in my mind and the elimination of such association gives me a fundamental insight of that what I ought to be.

This fundamental state has to do with the elimination of a thought as I knew it now. A thought as I knew it now depends on my subjectivity whenever my mind thinks, whenever it happens to think about that what is coming, that is expectation, and that what has gone on, that is my past. The mind ought to function at a moment of existence in order to become free from that what now binds the mind to earth. If I could actualize for myself the moment when I exist and I experience that, then I could have an experience in which there need not be any thought for that what happens and no further interpretation or description. Exactly the same if I could at a certain time when I become simultaneously interested with that what exists that only at that point I could be truly impartial.

Again now I refer to Work, observation, to take in as if I become aware, not see, but become aware of the existence of myself, my physical body, in manefestation in an impartial way, that is without identification, without something of me going out towards that what is being seen, and also that this can take place at the moment of existence. Understand this moment. It is very important to see this. If you don't understand this, you don't understand Gurdjieff. It is centered about the question of how can one become One. A little while ago I said the telescoping of an octave into one point - that is, the 'do' and 'do' united, this we don't know by experience. We do know something that almost would create it. It is an overtone in music. That is, whenever a note 'do' is struck, I also strike at the same time with the vibration rates of the particular string the note 'do' one octave higher. I describe as another overtone a quint, another fourth, and all the way up, if my ear is sensitive enough I can hear sixteen overtones from the original 'do.'

What Work means is that I try to hear the overtone in that what is possible for me by trying to kill the fundamental 'do'. The fundamental 'do' of myself is myself as I am unconscious. The overtones give me the indication of the possibility of consciousness, of a vibration of a higher rate. I do this when I strike a note 'do' - I kill the original. But if it is a piano and if there are several strings, the 'do' next one octave higher continues to vibrate and has that sound one octave higher. I have not ~~xxx~~ struck it; I have only struck the fundamental. Applied to life it means this: man as he is is able to strike in his life a 'do' of his life - this is his life. This is based on his experience, of the way he has been brought up, the way his life has started, the way it has developed. During

this 'de', expressing itself in the different forms of his existence, he has struck at times overtones of his life. He has forgotten them. They have been covered up by all kind of civilizations for himself. That is, the burying of that what was essential in him which has been covered by all the different experiences interpreted in his way, in a subjective manner, in order, he says, for himself to save his life. It is in reality to safeguard his essence, or to protect it in such a way that it will not be disturbed or it will not be hurt. Nevertheless, the overtones have been there and can only be brought, I would almost say, to light - they can only be brought to sound when the original 'de' has been eliminated or partly killed, or partly reduced in its effect as an obstacle from preventing the other overtones to be heard. X

The problem now: I find myself with my life the way it is, with all the different wishes belonging to my body, belonging to my feeling center and belonging to my mind. I'm attached to all these phenomena, I'm attached to my life, I'm attached to that what I represent. Sometimes I'm so attached to my name that I love it. I may be vain, I may hope that it will also be recognized by others. I call it self love of myself because it engages my feelings, it is not just a matter of describing it and hoping that someone else will understand it. I want from others the recognition that I am somebody and not just, as Gurdjieff would call it, tail of a donkey. This is what I many times wish for other people to see, that I am something, and if they don't realize it, I feel hurt, I will go through all kind of contortions in order to explain to them that I'm worth much more than they think so that then I become happy, I will be happy when I'm a little flattered, when I'm noticed, when I'm recognized in my place and that I feel that for that I have a certain reason for my

existence.

There are few people who can live without others; there are few people who are contained within themselves. There are few peo ple who do now know and who do not need anyone. All of us are subject to that kind of an influence, and all of us are affected, and affected in such away that we want to maintain for ou selves what we call a self respect, which is dependent on the opinion of other people. I'm not talking even about the necessity of our contortions in order to get along in the world or to be able to maintain a position or to lick someone's boots or to have enough money to be able to live or that for such reasons I compromise, many times, and that of course I lie, sometimes like hell. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking only about what I, of myself, know of myself, and in what respect I'm not at all myself but I am what I am so-called appeart to be to the rest of the world and I'm satisfied by being recognized as such. And I've learned only that and I've unlearned, or forgotten what I am really and I've never gone to school to find out what is my essence, what was and used to be there when I was young and the reasons why I have lost that kind of - I call it 'I' dentity. I think Daly King uses that - 'I dentity'. It's quite right. It is an 'I' what was there but there is a dent in it. It is not true anymore. It's my fault probably if I knew that it happened and continued to be; it's not my fault when it is in ignorance. Still when I try to unde it I see that I am attached to that kind of identification and that the real 'I' of myself is at the present time and will be for quite some time completely covered up by what I call the certain layers of my own civilization - that what is my culture, my education, the way I am.

What am I? Standing on the past now, seeing that what I am, what I wish to become in the future, by realizing that what I am at this present moment. This is the problem for man, it is the problem for all of us. It is the problem of how to become serious and honest regarding that what I see and the willingness that I want to try to continue to see what I am and that that, for the time being, I wish to live with and then I establish, if I possibly can, a kind of a faculty which I call an objective one regarding that what I really am x xxxxx recording such facts for me in my brain, in a certain place where they can stay, and stay without necessarily being sailed by other thoughts which associate with them. I'm looking for the purity of a mental function. I'm looking for that mental capacity which can stay by itself, without being affected by any other center. I'm looking for the possibility in myself of having the three centers independently functioning. This is extremely important to see that the condition in which I am now is so far removed from it thatit isn't even funny.

I call that what I feel, I express it by means of a description of my body. To feel independently of my body is xx impossible. Seldom that I can think without going over into a form of activity. By 'form of activity' I don't mean necessarily amovement, but I mean a state in which my body findsitself on account of a thought, an expression of the face, or a tensing of the muscles of course is a form of activity. And it's closely related to the thought I have. If I worry, how doesmy face look? If I'm jealous, how is my face? If I get angry, which may be emotional, but angry because of an insult which I recognize with my mind, how I hate when I express it as hate. What does my body do? Want to hit someone, tensing up muscles. I keep my mouth shut, I bite my tongue. All these things of course

are physical expressions as a result of that what either I feel or what I think. It is not a man, because you see, he doesn't know how to control any one of such centers. There is absolutely no one who might be called a master, who might be in charge, but each center just does what it pleases and it does it at any one time it wants to without considering some other center, or with interfering with the activities of another center. And I am as a human being, if I am honest, I am a hodge-podge of all such kind of things which, without any rhyme or reason could become available to me if there was something that I could call a guide. But where is the guide? And as a result, I am a reacting creature. I constantly am out of control. I am affected by practically everything that happens around me and I don't know where to place it.

All this sounds of course idiotic for anyone who has no idea about HE himself. But the more one starts a little bit and the more one starts to learn that what is perhaps a little closer to the truth, the more we will admit that that is really a picture of myself, being affected, pursuaded, set upon, being driven, forced, by everything outside of me without within me having any possibility of counteracting it in the proper way. And of course then I say I'm flexible. I'm very nice, I'm kind. I'm good. I can do this. Sure I go along with so and so and for that reason I start again to love myself. How wonderful I am; in reality I love my weakness. I don't dare to stand up for a principle or a convictien. I agree with the last speaker. I have no opinion of my own because I don't have enough experiences and only when I do something really well that I approach the possibility of that kind of truth and then in that direction I dare to say, 'but I know.' In all directions, many of them which I simply assume that I have a certain knowledge the next person who wants to argue with me and happens to know just a little

bit more, I'm completely flat on my back because I can't even fight back. ~~Thixxweakness~~

This weakness, this kind of character trait, this kind of, what I call simply, an unconscious state, this kind of lack of character, this kind of lack of manliness, exists in all of us. Like it or not, that is the condition of mankind at the present time and that is partly due to his so-called progress. That is our industrial progress, and so-called his wish and will to maintain that what is his weakness and his lack of being able to oppose it because he doesn't have the knowledge how to do it. You see, this has absolutely nothing to do with the acquisition and accumulation of knowledge as data in one's mind. It has nothing to do with a certain dexterity of a surgeon. It has nothing to do with an artist who creates in an ordinary way or in an ~~xxxxxx~~ extraordinary way certain things that remain subjective expression. I'm talking about a person who wants a spiritual development of that what does not exist primarily in him which he wants to bring to the foreground and which surely if he dares will not be appreciated ~~x~~ very much by the people outside because he will be in that sense really an outsider. An outsider to the rest of the world. He is not a five and ten cent man who is standardized. He is different and because of that he will be criticized and he will have a terrible time.

How can I grow up in becoming conscious without being affected by the rest of the world? To start with myself in such a way doing that ~~wxx~~ what I am supposed to do while at the same time I cont9nue to ~~dx~~ be a man in life to the extent that I possibly can. The continuation of that what is for me a responsibility in living and at the same time trying to wake up to that what I am in life. You see,

this is an entirely different viewpoint from the possible development of any one of the three centers because with thatI withdraw from life. Gurdjieff does not call it the fourth way sometimes, it is a little bit, it is more an indication by Ouspensky. But the fourth way is really the kind of thing in which the three centers could develop simultaneously and that what is called exercises, movements, effect impressions by means of music with movements. Affect of movements as related to a mind having to direct certain ways of behavior patterns of the body. This is as far as movements are concerned in the possibility of the application in the sense of a physical center. Music which Gurdjieff has written, which sometimes is expressed in certain forms, partly for movements and partly as sacred dance forms, partly as producing because of the tone combination a certain affect on one in which one becomes physically affected. Which one at times tries to imitate to realize what is meant by a rhythm or by a combination of sound which perhaps may be cacophonical, sometimes harmonious in our sense of the word. But in any event who can affect a mind in a certain way by the necessity of trying to register that what is unusual.

As far as Work, when one talks theoretically about Work, when there is something one wants to learn as a method, one wants to learn it by first to become clear in one's mind what is meant by objectivity. And then the application of that in seeing and becoming aware of the manifestations of the body and that then with that my wish to continue and to overcome the difficulty is furnished by what I call my feeling center as a wish to want to become aharmonious man. The concept one has for that is that a man functions in all the possibilities of his three centers in a harmonious state of equilibrium or balance. Now this again is Work, that is now expressed as we sit and perhaps

as you listen and you try to extract from it what is it new that you can take with you for tomorrow or tonight. And impression of some kine, a wish maybe of some kind, perhaps something you feel you ought to do.

What will you do? An awareness of yourself as you are in a variety of different conditions, and when one becomes aware that then that what one sees, one tries to become free, nonidentified, try to see an acceptance for whatever it is and then perhaps to try to understand what is meant by the moment, by each moment of one's life, by each moment in time, by each moment, by taking the duration apart, by eliminating the movements of a moment which describes time and reducing that moment which is now, moving to the point of observing. When I became aware then, and then continue, new moments are substituted for the old, which are identical in their substance as moment and as a result it might be possible that during such a time of observation I describe for myself something that remains objective to that what continues as my life. This I call the existence of my ~~xxx~~ 'I' which after it is being fed sufficiently develops its own octave of existence. It still disappears when it is below the 'fa' at do re mi - at times there is no 'I' - at certain times there is a possibility of overbridging 'fa'. Also that is again subject to a law. It is a law of the repetition of result. Such a law again is subject to a law of an octave so that the maximum ~~xxxx~~ totality of such results accumulating help me to overbridge that 'fa' in that law in order then to have enough energy in the first law to overbridge the 'fa' in the first law to reach (sol'.

It sounds very complicated. It isnot so complicated. It simply means the continued wish to cont9nue to work will finally produce an 'I' which can start to function and will not disappear. Then I can count on it. This disappearance is simply because it is not as yet sufficiently grown and also that what originally placed 'I' as a function, that what instigated that is not as yet sufficiently con nected with one's feeling center. I will just say a few words about that.

Magnetic Center, when it starts to operate as a wish for oneself to evolve, divides, one part becomespart of one's real conscience, the other becomes a part of one's consciousness. When they have grown sufficiently, they take over. They become the potentiality and the actuality afterwards of that what is called in the Gurdjieffian sense as Kesdjanian body, as emotional body and soul body as intellectual body. And that then, when at the same time that is again simultaniety is introduced for the development of XX 'I', then when the three bodies exist that then under theinfluence of 'I' - this time being full grown - they fuse into one and then this unity becomes for 'I' the servant with which 'I' continues its own existence on a higher level of being than man as he is at the present time unconscious now occupied.

Well don't lets talk anymore. My suggestion to all those who are interested a little is to read and to find out what is meant. Read All and Everything if you really want to read something that is worthwhile. If you don't, read Ouspensky. It is also worthwhile, but it will not gixx give you the kind of emotional quality. It is nice and sometimes quite useful. I'm not saying very much against it, just a little bit. If you want to read some other books, you

can read different interpretations of expression of their own, experiences with Gurdjieff, and what they think. Sometimes a little bit drawn together, sometimes alittle bit separate from the reality of Gurdjieff, only give a little phase. Again I say interesting enough. Read Remarkable Men if you want something from Gurdjieff that really gives an idea about man, who he could be, what they could be, what he considered remarkable as man. And there are many examples of that which are extremely useful for oneself, not that you want to imitate them but to know that such a thing exist. The destruction that is possible by means of reading All and Everything is useful because you will not accept things that you now experience them just at their face value. You will question a little bit more. It is really that what I so called see? Is that reality for me? That Gurdjieff talks through the book, through his works, through his method, through that what he represents. But whatever you do, make sure that you understand it. Don't allow your own interpretation, your own willingness, your own so called naievete, your own feeling regarding Work becomes a substitute for the exact knowledge of Work and whatis meant by objectivity. Don't forget that objectivity will not allow any subjectivity to define it. It has to remain pure, and in application it must be pure and if it is not pure it will lead you astray. It will not give you what you really hoped for and I will honestly tell you, it is a waste of time. Find out what is meant then work. See what you can do and be honest to admit that you don't know how to work as yet. And again and again try and again and aga8n come back to ABC, as I said, objectivity is observation is non identification and is the con ept of simultaneity. These are the three fundamentals inherent in the first step of work on oneself. The other two steps - that is the re and the mi - are what we call

participation, what has to be understood and it has to be explained and whatis sometimes called experimentation, which is the mi in that particular triad. But don't lets talk about that. Observation is more than enoug . It will give you experiences. When you talk in a group, talk about that. Talk about what you consider the truth for you. Don't talk about the thin s you have read. Leave them alone. They belong to someone else. If you apply what you have read on your own, you are entitled to talk about it. Don't be too theoretical. I may have been tonight, a little bit giving perspective. Don't allow it in an ordinary work group meeting. You t lk about what is meant by when you are w awake what you then see, what you then acknowledge to be the truth for .....(runs off)

End.